

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 299

UD 029 329

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; Kurtz, Norman R.
TITLE Monitoring Project CANAL Training Activities: Student Training Activities for 70 Project CANAL Schools (October 17, 1990 through June 6, 1991). Progress Report.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE May 92
NOTE 44p.; For related documents, see UD 029 327-331.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Attendance; Community Involvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Participation; *Program Implementation; Public Schools; *Student Participation; *Training; Urban Schools; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Progress Reporting; *Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was done to assess the participation of students from the 70 Creating a New Approach to Learning Project (Project CANAL) schools in training activities organized by Project CANAL. Two activities were included. The first, titled "student Workshops," consisted of a series of five 1-day workshops that sought to provide students with vision and motivation for achievement, and also to involve students in special projects to be presented at a second activity titled, "Celebrating Student Achievement." This activity consisted of a 1-day workshop at which students were given an opportunity to present the results of the projects they had identified during the earlier workshops. The goal of Project CANAL is to promote the academic achievement of students. The number of student training activities was small, and the training activity that was offered did not attract wide attendance on the part of students. When principals, teachers, ancillary staff, and parents of the 70 core planning teams and members of the local school councils were invited to the second training activity, only a few appeared. Specifically, at schools in Phase I of the CANAL Project, 29 percent of the events held had no attendance, only 7.6 percent had 4 or more students. At Phase II schools, 25 percent of events had no attendance and 3.6 percent of events had 3 students. Sixteen tables and profiles of Phase I and II schools are provided. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED359299

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- ☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Jones
Monit. Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES: STUDENT TRAINING FOR 70 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS (OCTOBER 17, 1990 THROUGH JUNE 6, 1991)

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

May 1992

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Henry Martinez
Chairperson

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation monitors
The Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools

W0029329

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Henry H. Martinez, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate

Uthman Muhammad

Mari C. Fohrman

George E. Riddick

Carlos Heredia

Aida Sanchez-Romano

Gwendolyn Laroche

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION CONSULTANTS

Norman R. Kurtz

Doris M. Williams

COMMISSION STAFF

Alice H. Blackburn, Field Monitor

Nalini Kandallu, Research Assistant

Barb Leebens-Osilaja, Director of Communications

Katina Hardimon, Student Office Assistant

Ana Tapia, Project Director

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
4th Floor, Center Building, Northwest
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 535-8220
FAX (312) 535-4218

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRESS REPORT

OF

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES:

**STUDENT TRAINING ACTIVITIES
FOR 70 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS
(OCTOBER 17, 1990 THROUGH JUNE 6, 1991)**

*Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant*

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
STUDENT WORKSHOPS	1
A. Purpose	1
B. Participation of the 42 Phase I CANAL Schools	2
C. Participation of the 28 Phase II CANAL Schools	5
CELEBRATING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	7
A. Purpose	7
B. Participation of 42 Phase I CANAL Schools	8
C. Participation of 28 Phase II CANAL Schools	11
SUMMARY	15
APPENDICES	16
Appendix A: Summary Tables of Project CANAL Training for Students	17
Appendix B: Profiles of Phase I and II CANAL Schools	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops Summary of Sessions Attended by 42 Phase I CANAL Schools (Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20, and March 20, 1991)	3
Table 2 - Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops Number of Workshops 42 Phase I CANAL Schools Attended (Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)	4
Table 3 - Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops Summary of Sessions Attended by 28 Phase II CANAL Schools (Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)	6
Table 4 - Project CANAL Training: Student Workshop Number of Workshops 28 Phase II CANAL Schools Attended (Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)	7
Table 5 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of CPT Constituencies Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	8
Table 6 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of Students Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	9
Table 7 - Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops and Celebrating Achievement: 42 Phase I Schools Missing One or Both Training Activities	10
Table 8 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of CPT Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	11

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table 9 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of CPT Constituencies Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	12
Table 10 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of Students Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	13
Table 11 - Project Canal Training: Student Workshops and Celebrating Achievement Phase II CANAL Schools Missing One or Both Training	14
Table 12 - Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement Number of CPT Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools (June 7, 1991)	14

EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

**PROGRESS REPORT: MONITORING PROJECT CANAL
STUDENT TRAINING ACTIVITIES
FOR 70 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS
(October 17, 1990 to June 7, 1991)**

The purpose of this report is to assess the participation of students from the 70 Project CANAL schools in training activities organized by Project CANAL. Two activities are included: The first titled, "Student Workshops" consisted of a series of five, one day workshops presented on October 17, December 18, 1990; and, January 23, February 20 and March 20, 1991. The workshops focused on providing students with vision and motivation for achievement. They also sought to involve students in a special project which was presented at a second activity titled, "Celebrating Student Achievement". The second activity consisted of a one-day workshop held on June 7, 1991.

The ultimate goal of Project CANAL is to promote the academic achievement of students. This suggests a high priority on student participation in Project CANAL activities. Yet, the number of student training activities are few, and the training activity that was offered and is reported on here did not attract wide attendance on the part of students. Further, when principals, teachers, ancillary staff, and parents of the 70 core planning teams (CPTs), and members of the local school councils (LSCs) were invited to the second training activity, the presentation of the student projects, only a handful appeared. Participation is evaluated separately for the Phase I and Phase II CANAL schools.

If all of the 42 Phase CANAL I schools had attended each of the five days of "Student Workshops" it would have resulted in $42 \times 5 = 210$ attendance events. Given the 210 potential attendance events the following was found:

- 29 percent of the events had no attendance;
- 14.8 percent had only one student attend;
- 33.8 percent had two students;
- 14.8 percent had three students; and,
- Only 7.6 percent had four or more students, and on only one occasion were as many as seven students present for a school.

A similar pattern was observed for Phase II schools. In the case of the 28 Phase II schools there were $28 \times 5 = 140$ potential attendance events. The results show that:

- 25.7 percent of the events had no attendance;
- 12.1 percent had only one student attend;
- 50.1 percent had only two students;
- 7.9 percent had three students; and,
- 3.6 percent had four students.

Thus, given the potential, only a small portion of students were present to take advantage of the workshops:

The activity, "Celebrating Student Achievement" also received a modest response.

- Nine Phase I and nine Phase II schools had no students attend;
- Eight Phase I and six Phase II schools had only one student present;
- 18 Phase I and seven Phase II schools had two students attend; and,
- Only seven Phase I and six Phase II schools had more than three students present.

Members of CPTs and LSCs were invited to the celebration of student projects but:

- Only one principal of all 70 schools came;
- 15 Phase I and 12 Phase II schools (27 of 70) had no teachers present;
- 31 Phase I and 21 Phase II schools (52 of 70) had no parents present;
- 39 Phase I and 27 Phase II schools (66 of 70) had no ancillaries present; and,
- 34 Phase I and 25 Phase II schools (59 of 70) had no LSC members attend.

The evidence from attendance suggests that the student training activities deserve careful attention given the focus of Project CANAL on student achievement.

Project CANAL (Creating A New Approach to Learning) was funded by monies granted in 1987 under the Settlement Agreement between the United States and the Chicago Board of Education to relieve the effects of segregation in racially identifiable black and Hispanic schools. The Project proposes "...to alleviate the educational inequities that have affected the academic achievement of Chicago public school children who are enrolled in selected racially identifiable schools."

Utilizing a school-based management system, principals, teachers, ancillary staff, parents, and students will develop and implement a school improvement plan focusing on increased student achievement through enhancing staff professionalism and parent involvement." (CANAL Proposal, p. ii).

Phase I schools of CANAL are 42 schools selected at the outset of Project CANAL in the Fall 1988 while Phase II schools are 28 schools that were added to the Project in the fall of 1990.

For further information contact Barbara Leebens-Osilaja, director of communications, (312) 535-8220.

INTRODUCTION

Project CANAL offered two special training activities for students from the 70 CANAL schools. The first training activity for students consisted of a series of five workshops. The five workshops were held for one day each during the months of October and December 1990, and January, February and March 1991. The second training activity was titled, "Celebrating Student Achievement." It was related to the first training activity in that special projects developed by students during the five one-day workshops were presented and members of the core planning teams (CPTs) were invited to attend.

The purpose of the analysis provided here is to evaluate the extent of participation in the two training activities of Project CANAL. While the training activities combined Phase I (schools that making up the original 42 CANAL schools in the fall of 1988) and Phase II (28 schools added to Project CANAL in the fall of 1990), their participation is analyzed separately to assess potential differences in the response of Phase I and Phase II schools to the training opportunities.¹

STUDENT WORKSHOPS

A. Purpose

Project CANAL offered a series of five one-day workshops for students in October, December 1990 and in January, February and March 1991. The intent of the workshop was described as: "Student workshops continue to address the theme, 'Student Leaders For Change,' in which students considered career choices, practiced negotiation skills, and wrote

¹ A list of the Phase I and Phase II CANAL schools can be found in the Appendices.

proposals for student-initiated projects at their respective schools".² Five workshops were offered covering several different topics. The first workshop was titled, "Can't Touch This, Student Leaders for Change," with a focus on the qualities of leadership. The second, "Can't Touch This, Choices for the Future," focused on the issue of making choices in the present that will be good for the future. The third workshop, "Can't Touch This, Student Leaders for Change," reviewed basics in communications, negotiations and proposal writing. The fourth emphasized black history, "Can't Touch This, Student Leaders for Change" while the fifth required students to develop an activity that would be carried out over several months. It was this activity that was presented to CPT members in the session titled, "Celebrating Student Achievement".

B. Participation of the 42 Phase I CANAL Schools

Table 1 provides a summary of the participation of the 42 Phase I schools. The left hand column of Table 1 shows the number of participants from each school in each of the five sessions. Thus, 10 of the 42 schools had no one at the session on October 17, 1990; five schools had one student in attendance; 20 schools had two students; five had three students; one had four students; and, one had five students.

Participation in the five training sessions can be conceptualized in terms of the number of attendance events that were attended. The attendance events consist of the number of schools (42 Phase I CANAL schools) times the number of training sessions (5). Thus, there are 42 schools X 5 workshops = 210 potential attendance events. The extreme

² Project CANAL, Quarterly Progress Report, February 28, 1991, p. 8.

TABLE 1

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
Summary of Sessions Attended by 42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

Number of Students Present	Date of Workshop and Attendance					Percent of Total*
	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	
0	10	18	12	11	10	29.0 %
1	5	0	4	11	11	14.8 %
2	20	14	16	10	11	33.8 %
3	5	9	5	7	5	14.8 %
4	1		4	2	3	4.8 %
5	1	1			1	1.4 %
6				1	1	1.0 %
7			1			.4 %
Total	42	42	42	42	42	210

right hand column of percent of total represents the percent of each category across the five sessions. The percent of 0 attendances is the sum of schools with no attendance across the five sessions $10 + 18 + 12 + 11 + 10 = 61$ divided by 210 equals 29.0 %.

Table 1 shows the percent of attendance events that were attended by the 42 schools. The extreme left hand column of Table 1 shows that schools did not take advantage of 29 percent of the 210 events. Another way to think about it is that on 29 percent of the potential events, schools did not send any students to the five training sessions. And 14.8 percent of the time the participating Phase I schools sent only one student; 33.8 percent of the time they sent two students; 14.8 percent of the time they sent three students; 4.8

percent of the time they sent four students; 1.4 percent of the time they sent five students; 1.0 percent of the time they sent six students; and, only once out of the 210 occasions did any school send as many as seven students. (A detailed description of attendance is provided in Table A in the Appendices.)

Table 2 depicts attendance in terms of the participation of individual schools. The table shows that five Phase I schools did not take part in any of the workshops, one school had students at only one, three took part in two workshops, five took part in three, 13 took

TABLE 2

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
Number of Workshops 42 Phase I CANAL Schools Attended
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

Number of Schools	Number of Workshops Schools Attended						Total Schools
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
	5	1	3	5	13	15	42

part in four, and 15 took part in all five of the sessions. Attending all five student workshop sessions were the following Phase I CANAL schools: Bass, Bennett/Shedd, Dett, DuBois, Dumas, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Hearst, Howe, Manierre, Orr, Sherman, Spencer and Sumner.

Tables 1 and 2 indicate that participation of Project CANAL schools in student workshops surprisingly was limited. Table 1 shows that 29 percent of the time CANAL schools had no one at the workshop, an additional 14.8 percent of the time only one student

was available to represent the school, and 33.8 percent of the time only two students were there. Adding these statistics together, 77.6 percent of the time CANAL schools had two or fewer students in attendance. Thus, most of the time, very few available students from any school took part in the training.

Table 2 indicates that as many as five of the 42 Phase I schools received no benefits whatsoever because they attended none of the five sessions. Four more schools were at only one or two of the sessions, and an additional five schools had someone there at only three of the sessions. Given the large number of potential number of students who could have attended, the actual level of participation suggests little enthusiasm for the CANAL training.

C. Participation of 28 Phase II CANAL Schools

The 28 Phase II CANAL schools showed patterns of attendance similar to those of the Phase I CANAL schools as shown in Table 3. A large number of the workshops saw no students from Phase II schools attend. Attendance events were calculated for the 28 Phase II schools across the training days (5) as for Phase I schools. There were 28 schools X 5 workshop sessions = 140 attendance events for Phase II schools.

Percent of total represents the percent of each category across the five sessions. Thus, $28 \times 5 = 140$ is the total potential attendances of the 28 schools across the five sessions. The percent of 0 attendances is the sum of schools with no attendance across the five sessions $10 + 10 + 5 + 5 + 6 = 36$ divided by 140 equals 25.7 %.

Table 3 shows that 25.7 percent of the 140 attendance events were not attended. On an additional 12.1 percent of the occasions, only one student represented a school. About half of the time, 50.7 percent, two students represented schools, three students were

TABLE 3

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
Summary of Sessions Attended by 28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

Number of Students Present	Date of Workshop and Attendance					Percent of Total*
	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	
0	10	10	5	5	6	25.7 %
1	2	0	1	9	5	12.1 %
2	14	14	20	9	14	50.7 %
3	1	3	1	3	3	7.9 %
4	1	1	1	2		3.6 %
Total	28	28	28	28	28	140

there on only 7.9 percent of the training events and the most students present for any Phase II school was four, which happened on only five occasions. Overall, very few students attended given the large number of students available. Details on attendance for each school are shown in Table B of Appendix A.

Table 4 shows the number of sessions at which a school was represented. As was true for Phase I schools, some of the Phase II schools attended none of the workshops while others had someone present at all five workshops. Only two of the 28 schools missed all five of the sessions. One school had students present at only one session; two schools had students attend two workshops; three had students present at three; nine schools had students attending four; and, 11 Phase II schools attended all five sessions.

Thus, as many as 20 of the schools were present at four or five of the workshops while only eight attended three or fewer. However, given the large number of students

TABLE 4

**Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
Number of Workshops 28 Phase II CANAL Schools Attended
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)**

Number of Schools	Number of Workshops Schools Attended						Total Schools
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
	2	1	2	3	9	11	42

available to go to the workshops, its difficult to know why not all schools were represented at all of them. And, even when represented, the number of students was quite small, never exceeding more than four students for any Phase II school at any one of the workshops.

CELEBRATING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A. Purpose

The second student training event titled, "Celebrating Student Achievement," was held on June 7. It was closely related to the five preceding days of workshops in that on the fifth workshop day students identified projects that they would work on, "Celebrating Student Achievement" provided the occasion for students to present the results of their projects. The project titles included: "I Too Am America"; "The Best Years of Our Lives"; "Essay: Chicago Public Schools Budget Cuts"; "Selections: I Love Rock and Roll The Sound of Music"; "Reducing Crime and Drugs In Our Schools"; and, "Ribbon in the Sky". In addition, a drill team and cheerleaders assisted in opening and closing the event. A girl's softball team also made a presentation.

B. Participation of 42 Phase I CANAL Schools

The purpose of the workshop, to celebrate the achievement of student projects, seems to be the kind of activity that would attract wide attendance, but it did not turn out to be the case, as shown in Table 5. The Table shows the total number of individuals in the various categories of the CPT members who came to the presentations. The most obvious conclusion is that besides students, not very many individuals came to the presentations. And, even student participation was very limited. Table 6 is organized to show the number of students who attended the workshop from each of the 42 Phase I schools.

TABLE 5

Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of CPT Constituencies Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)

Constituency	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Total	1	81	37	12	3	8	142

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff; LSC=local school council member.

Table 6 shows that nine schools had no students attending the session (the absences will be discussed in detail below) and eight schools had only one student present to celebrate student's achievements. Eighteen schools had two students present while three schools had students and another had four students attend. One school took much greater advantage of the opportunity than the others by sending 15 students to the celebration.

TABLE 6

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of Students Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

Number of Schools	Number of Students Attending						Total Schools
	0	1	2	3	4	15	
	8	9	18	3	3	1	42

Surprisingly, Table 6 indicates that as many as eight of the 42 schools, which is almost a fourth, had no students at the workshop. Referring back to Table 2, it shows that only five schools took no part in the five workshops for students. Two of the five schools also were absent from "Celebrating Student Achievement Workshop," but three of the five who took no part in the workshops that led to the celebration came to the celebration. In that only two Phase I schools were absent from both training activities, it means that seven of those absent from the celebration had taken part in the "Student Workshops" but didn't come to the celebration of those activities. A total of 11 schools were involved in absences in that two schools were absent from both activities, five were absent only from the "Student Workshops" and eight were absent only from the "Celebrating Student Achievement" activity. The absences are displayed in Table 7. The column totals show that eight of the 11 schools were absent from "Celebrating Student Achievement" and three were present.

The row totals in Table 7 show that five of the 11 schools were absent from the "Student Workshop" and six were present. The cells in Table 7 show that two schools were

TABLE 7

**CANAL Training: Student Workshops and Celebrating Achievement
Phase I Schools Missing One or Both Training Activities
(n = 11)**

Student Workshop	Celebrating Student Achievement		Total
	Absent	Present	
Absent	2	3	5
Present	6	0	6
Total	8	3	11

absent from both activities, three were absent from the "Student Workshop" but present at "Celebrating Student Achievement" while six were present at the "Student Workshop" but absent from "Celebrating Student Achievement".

Examination of the Table 7 suggests that 11 of the 42 schools received little benefit from the student training activities. Either they were absent from both activities, or they attended the workshops for students but missed the celebration activity, or they attended the celebration but missed the workshop activities around which the celebration was focused.

Assuming that CPT members from the 42 Phase I schools were invited to participate in "Celebrating Student Achievement," not many CPT members came to join the students as shown in Table 8. It shows that only one of the 42 principals came. Teachers were somewhat more likely to come, but 15 schools had no teacher present, 18 schools had only one teacher attend, seven had two, and only two schools had as many as three teachers come to take part in the presentations. Given the nature of the event, one might have

TABLE 8

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of CPT Attending: 42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

Category of CPT Member	Number CPT Representing School				Total Schools
	0	1	2	3	
Principal	41	1			42
Teachers	15	18	7	2	42
Parents	31	10	1		42
Ancillaries	39	3			42
LSC Members	34	8			42

expected more teachers to take interest in the workshop. Parents were not present for the majority of schools (31), while 10 schools had one parent attend and one school had two parents present. Only three schools had one ancillary staff appear for the event, while no LSC members were present for 34 schools and eight schools were represented by one LSC member. While not shown in Table 8, six schools had no one in attendance, including students, and another eight schools had students present but no one from the CPT or LSC. In general, the primary goal of Project CANAL, to inspire students with the support of a broad constituency of concerned people, did not materialize.

C. Participation of 28 Phase II CANAL Schools

Project CANAL's Phase II schools showed a pattern of attendance that was even less positive than that of the Phase I schools (see Table 9). The total number of individuals to

attend the sessions was very small. And, as in the case of Phase I schools, the students were most likely to attend. However, very few students were present given the very large potential number of students who could have attended from the Phase I schools. None of the Phase II principals attended. And, perhaps more surprising, only 31 teachers came. The failure of principals and teachers to attend must have had some significance for the participating students. A few parents came, 10, while only one ancillary staff appeared, and only three LSC members took advantage of the occasion.

TABLE 9

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of CPT Constituencies Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

Constituency*	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Total Attendees	0	44	31	10	1	3	89

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff; LSC=local school council member.

Table 10 provides an analysis of student attendance. Almost a third of the Phase II schools, nine of 28 schools, had no students take part in the celebration session. An additional six schools had only one student attend, seven schools had no more than two students, and only four schools had three students. Two schools stood out as exceptions, one having five and another seven students at the workshop. While those numbers are large relative to the number coming from most schools, they still represent only a handful of participants.

TABLE 10

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of Students Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

Number of Schools	Number of Students Attending						Total Schools
	0	1	2	3	5	7	
	9	6	7	4	1	1	28

As was true in the case of Phase I CANAL schools, some of the Phase II schools failed to take part in the series of five "Student Workshops" as well as "Celebrating Student Achievement." Table 11 shows that two schools had no students present at either of the two activities. Thus, they had no benefit from Project CANAL's efforts. An additional seven schools that had students take part in the "Student Workshop" failed to have any students at the "Celebrating Student Achievement" workshop. Thus, nine of the 28 schools, almost a third, failed to have students received the benefit of participating in both workshops and the celebration event. The failure on the part of such a large proportion of the Phase II CANAL schools suggests a major problem in program development. The general emphasis of Project CANAL on school-based management through shared decision-making apparently was not used in organizing the student activities. Or, the schools agreed on the activity, and then failed to follow through by having students to participate.

TABLE 11

CANAL Training: Student Workshops and Celebrating Achievement
Phase II Schools Missing One or Both Training Activities
(n = 9)

Student Workshop	Celebrating Student Achievement
	Absent
Absent	2
Present	7
Total	9

The participation of CPT and LSC members in "Celebrating Student Achievement" with Phase II schools is displayed in Table 12. The attendance data suggest that this was

TABLE 12

Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
Number of CPT Attending: 28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)

Category of CPT Member	Number CPT Representing Phase II Schools				Total
	0	1	2	4	
Principal	28				28
Teachers	12	5	9	2	28
Parents	21	4	3		28
Ancillaries	27	1			28
LSC Members	25	3			28

not a very important activity for the CPTs or LSCs. None of the 28 principals attended, almost half of the schools, 12 of 28, had no teachers present. Five schools had one teacher attend, nine schools had two, and two schools each had four teachers present. The lack of interest on the part of the teachers must have been disappointing to the students. Ancillary staff did not participate, only one such staff member attended. And, only three schools had one member of their LSC come to the event.

SUMMARY

The two activities that have been described here represent primary training events for students in Project CANAL schools. If the evidence from attendance is any indicator than the training activities were not seen as important by the majority of the participating schools. A number of schools not participate in any of the activities, those who took participate did so in small numbers, and only two or three schools stood out as exceptions. The lack of enthusiasm on the part of students' was replicated by the CPTs and LSCs. When invited to take part in celebrating the results of the students efforts in the workshops, they were by and large absent. Only one principal out of the 70 CANAL schools appeared at the event, and teachers failed to show up for 27 of the 70 schools. The evidence suggests that student involvement in Project CANAL, which should be central to the program, is minimal and of secondary importance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY TABLES
OF
PROJECT CANAL TRAINING FOR STUDENTS

TABLE A-1

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

School	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	Total
Bass	1	2	2	2	2	9
Bennett	2	2	4	4	4	16
Bradwell	3		2	2	2	9
Byford	1	2	2		4	9
Carter	2	2	1	1		6
Clark	2	2	2		1	7
Cooper						0
DePriest						0
Dett	2	2	1	4	2	11
DuBois	2	3	3	3	5	16
Dumas	5	5	7	6	6	29
DuSable						0
Dyett	2			1	4	7
Fernwood	2	2	2	1	2	9
Frazier	3		3	3	2	11
Gale		3	3	3	3	12
Goldblatt		3		1	2	6
Gregory	2	3	3	2	3	13
Guggenheim	3	2		2	3	10
Hammond	2	3	4	2	2	13
Hearst	2	2	2	2	2	10
Subtotal	36	38	41	39	49	203

TABLE A-1 (Continued)

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

School	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	Total
Howe	2	2	2	2	2	10
Hughes	1		2	2	2	7
Jungman	2		2			4
Kelvyn Park			2	1	1	4
Lafayette	2					2
Lowell	2		4	2	1	9
Manierre	1	2	2	1	1	7
Marin						0
Mayo	1	3		3	1	8
Moos	2			1		3
Orr	2	3	2	1	1	9
Piccolo M	3		4	3		10
Robeson		2	2	2	1	7
Sherman	3	2	3	3	3	14
Spencer	2	3	1	3	3	12
Stowe	4		2	1	1	8
Sumner	2	2	2	1	1	8
Terrell			1	1	1	3
Westinghouse	2				1	3
Williams	2	3	2		2	9
Woodson N						0
Subtotal	33	22	33	27	22	137
Total	69	60	74	66	71	340

TABLE A-2

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

School	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	Total
Beethoven	1	2	2	2		7
Carpenter		3	2	2	2	10
Carver	2	2	2	2	1	9
Einstein			2	2	2	6
Farren	2	2	2	1	2	9
Goethe	2	2	2	2	2	10
Harper	2	2	2	1	3	10
Hefferan		4	1	4	1	10
Holmes	2		2	1		5
Johnson		2	2	2	2	8
Manley	2	2	2	1	2	9
McCormick	2	3	2	3	2	12
McCormick Br			2		2	4
Medill						0
Mollison	2	2	2	1	2	9
Nash	2	2	4	2	2	12
Penn	4	4	3	4	3	18
Perry	2		2	1	2	7
Piccolo E	2		2	1	2	7
Phillips		2	2	1	1	6
Prescott		3	2	3	3	11
Ryerson	3	2	2	2	1	10
Schiller	2	2			2	8
Subtotal	32	41	46	39	39	197

TABLE A-2

Project CANAL Training: Student Workshops
28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(Oct. 17 and Dec. 18, 1990; Jan. 23, Feb. 20 and March 20, 1991)

School	10/17/90	12/18/90	1/23/91	2/20/91	3/20/91	Total
Spry	2			2	2	6
Van Vlissingen	1	2	2	2	1	8
Von Humboldt	2			1		3
Wells		2				2
Woodson S						0
Subtotal	5	4	2	5	3	19
Total	37	45	48	44	42	216
Unknown*	3			1		4

* Three students attended on 10/17/90 and one on 2/20/90 without indicating any school affiliation.

TABLE A-3

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

School	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Bass		4					4
Bennett		1	1	1			3
Bradwell		3	2				5
Byford	1	4	3				8
Carter		2	1			1	4
Clark		2					2
Cooper		1	1	1	1		4
DePriest							0
Dett							0
DuBois		2	1				3
Dumas		2	2				4
DuSable		2					2
Dyett		3					3
Fernwood		2	1		1	1	5
Frazier							0
Gale		2	2				4
Goldblatt		2	1			1	4
Gregory		3	1	1			5
Guggenheim		2					2
Hammond		2	3	1		1	7
Subtotal	1	39	19	4	2	4	69

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff;
LSC=member of the local school council.

TABLE A-3 (Continued)

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
42 Phase I CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

School	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Hearst		1					1
Howe		4					4
Hughes		2	1	1		1	5
Jungman			2				2
Kelvyn Park		1	1	2	1		5
Lafayette							0
Lowell		1	1	1			3
Manierre		2					2
Marin							0
Mayo		15	1	1			17
Moos		1	1				2
Orr		1	1				2
Piccolo M							0
Robeson			1				1
Sherman		2	2				4
Spencer		2				1	3
Stowe		2		1			3
Sumner		2	1	1		1	5
Terrell		1	1				2
Wells							
Westinghouse		1	2				3
Williams		2	2				4
Woodson N		2	1	1		1	5
Subtotal	0	42	18	8	1	4	73
Total	1	81	37	12	3	8	142

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff;
LSC=member of the local school council.

TABLE A-4

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

School	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Beethoven		3	2				5
Carpenter		2	4	2		1	9
Carver		5	1				6
Einstein		2	2				4
Farren		2	2				4
Goethe		1			1		2
Harper		1		1			2
Hefferan		3	2				5
Holmes		2	1	2		1	6
Johnson		2	2	1			5
Madero							0
Manley							0
McCormick		3	2	1			6
Medill				1			1
Mollison		2	2	2			6
Nash							0
Penn		1	2				3
Perry		2					2
Phillips		7	1			1	9
Piccolo E							0
Subtotal	0	38	23	10	1	3	75

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff;
LSC=member of the local school council.

TABLE A-4 (Continued)

**Project CANAL Training: Celebrating Student Achievement
28 Phase II CANAL Schools
(June 7, 1991)**

School	P	S	T	Par	Anc	LSC	Total
Prescott		3	1				4
Ryerson							0
Schiller		1					1
Spry		1	2				3
Van Vlissingen			1				1
Von Humboldt		1	4				5
Woodson S							0
Subtotal	0	6	8	0	0	0	14
Total	0	44	31	10	1	3	89

P=principal; S=student; T=teacher; Par=parent; Anc=ancillary staff;
LSC=member of the local school council.

APPENDIX B
PROFILE OF PHASE I AND II CANAL SCHOOLS

**Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Profiles of
PROJECT CANAL SCHOOLS (PHASE I AND II SCHOOLS)
1991-1992**

(Alphabetical Listing - 70 Schools)

SCHOOLS	DISTRICT	ADDRESS	COMPOSITION	STUDENTS	PRINCIPAL
Bass (K-8)	8	1140 W. 66th St.	100% Black	812	Marcella Gillie
* Beethoven (K-8)	8	25 W. 47th St.	100% Black	841	Lula Ford
Bennett (K-8)	9	10115 S. Prairie	99.6% Black	690+	John McCormick
Bradwell (K-8)	9	7736 S. Burnham	100% Black	1122	Camille Roby
Byford (K-6)	1	5600 W. Iowa St.	99.0% Black	583	Barbara Wade
* Carpenter (K-8)	3	1250 W. Erie St.	81.1% Hispanic	729	Rudolph Salmeron
Carter (K-8)	8	5740 S. Michigan	99.7% Black	716	Rita Mitchell
* Carver H.S.	11	1310 S. Doty Ave.	99.4% Black	950	Marcellus Stamps, Jr.
Clark (6-9)	4	5101 W. Harrison	85.2% Black	988	Marietta Beverly
Cooper (K-5)	5	1624 W. 19th St.	99.0% Hispanic	821	William Noonan
DePriest (K-6)	4	140 S. Central Ave.	99.8% Black	610	Ruth Knight
Dett (K-8)	4	2306 W. Maypole	100% Black	528	Donald Feinstein
DuBois (K-8)	10	330 E. 133rd St.	97.6% Black	453	Joyce Johnson
Dumas (K-8)	6	6650 S. Ellis Ave.	100% Black	806+	Sylvia Peters
DuSable H.S.	11	4934 S. Wabash	100% Black	1383	Charles Mingo
Dyett (K-8)	8	555 E. 51st St.	100% Black	842	Yvonne Minor

SCHOOLS	DISTRICT	ADDRESS	COMPOSITION	STUDENTS	PRINCIPAL
• Einstein (K-8)	6	3830 S. Cottage Gr.	100% Black	456	Phyllis O. Tate
• Farren (K-8)	8	5055 S. State St.	100% Black	831	William Auksi
Fernwood (K-8)	10	10041 S. Union	100% Black	518	George Turk
Frazier (K-8)	5	5300 Hermitage	98.2% Black	607	
Gale (K-8)	2	1631 W. Jonquil	61.6% Black	983	Edis Snyder
• Goethe (K-8)	3	2236 N. Rockwell	86.7% Hispanic	1025	Jean Walker
Goldblatt (K-8)	4	4257 W. Adams St.	100% Black	726	Lillian Nash
Gregory (K-8)	5	3715 W. Polk St.	100% Black	650	Sherye Garmony
Guggenheim (K-8)	8	7141 S. Morgan St.	100% Black	399	Michael Alexander
Hammond (K-6)	5	2819 W. 21st St.	95.2% Hispanic	882	S. Ortiz Revaldo
• Harper H.S.	11	6520 S. Wood St.	100% Black	1237	Barbara Pulliam
Hearst (K-8)	7	4640 W. Lammon	99.3% Black	822	Theresa Byrd-Smith
• Hefferan (K-8)	4	4409 W. Wilcox	99.8% Black	648	Patricia Harvey
• Holmes (K-5)	7	955 Garfield	99.9% Black	786	Richard Bradley
Howe (K-8)	1	720 N. Lorel Ave.	100% Black	1111	Barbara Moore
Hughes (K-8)	5	4247 W. 15th St.	97.7% Black	397	Audrey Cooper
• Johnson (K-8)	5	1420 S. Albany	97.2% Black	360	Mattie B. Tyson
Jungman (K-6)	5	1746 S. Miller St.	96.6% Hispanic	674 +	Fausto Lopez
Kelvyn Park H.S.	11	4343 Wrightwood	90.6% Hispanic	1655	Betzaida Figueroa
Lafayette (K-6)	3	2714 W. Augusta	72.8% Hispanic	1194	Efrain Orduz

SCHOOLS	DISTRICT	ADDRESS	COMPOSITION	STUDENTS	PRINCIPAL
Lowell (K-8)	3	3320 W. Hirsch St.	76.5% Hispanic	877	Margoann T. Brown
Manierre (K-8)	2	1420 N. Hudson	98.0% Black	508	Marlene G. Szymanski
* Manley H.S.	11	2935 W. Polk	99.6% Black	830	Katherine Flanagan
Marin (K-5)	3	3320 W. Evergreen	74.1% Hispanic	316	David Espinoza
Mayo (K-8)	6	249 E. 37th St.	99.8% Black	614	Ida Cross
* McCormick (K-8)	5	2712 S. Sawyer	98.7% Hispanic	1027	James W. Crowe
* McCormick Br. (5-8)	5	2832 W. 24th St.	97.7% Hispanic	481	Rosa Ramirez
* Medill Primary (K-3)	4	1301 W. 14th St.	100% Black	487	Doris Scott
* Mollison (K-8)	6	4415 S. King Drive	100% Black	499	Andrea S. Kerr
Moos (K-6)	3	1711 N. California	85.0% Hispanic	992+	Alice Peters
* Nash (K-8)	4	4837 W. Erie St.	99.6% Black	1198	Richard D. Kerr
Orr H.S.	11	730 N. Pulaski Rd.	94.4% Black	1611	Ken VanSpankeren
* Penn (K-8)	5	1616 S. Avers	93.2% Black	785	Philip A. Ragan
* Perry (K-8)	9	9130 S. University	99.5% Black	651	Sandra F. Lewis
* Phillips H.S.	11	244 Pershing Road	100% Black	1379	Juanita Tucker
* Piccolo El. (K-5)	3	1040 N. Keeler	70.4% Black	883	Linda Sienkiewicz

SCHOOLS	DISTRICT	ADDRESS	COMPOSITION	STUDENTS	PRINCIPAL
Piccolo Md. (6-8)	3	1040 N. Keeler	67.4% Black	663	Thomas Stewart
* Prescott (K-8)	3	1632 Wrightwood	76.2% Hispanic	478	Hugh Edward Levoy
Robeson H.S.	11	6835 S. Normal Av.	100% Black	1365	Jacqueline Simmons
* Ryerson (K-8)	3	646 Lawndale	99.8% Black	659	Donald J. Schmitt
* Schiller (4-9)	2	640 Scott St.	100% Black	330	Ervin J. Bond
Sherman (K-8)	7	1000 W. 52nd St.	98.3% Black	830	James E. Smith
Spencer (K-5)	4	214 N. Lavergne	100 % Black	1182	Dandridge-Alexander
* Spry (K-8)	5	2400 S. Marshall	94.5% Hispanic	1362	Benedict Natzke, Jr.
Stowe (K-8)	3	3444 W. Wabansia	90.5% Hispanic	1450	Blanca Trevino
Sumner (K-8)	5	4320W. 5th Ave.	95.4 Black	629	Donna Williams
Terrell (K-8)	8	5410 S. State St.	100% Black	702	Reva Hairston
*VanVlissingen (K-8)	10	137 108th Place	100% Black	897	Jacqueline Carothers
*Von Humboldt (K-8)	3	2620 W. Hirsch St.	70.1% Hispanic	1178	Edwin C. Tyska
* Wells Com. H.S.	11	936 Ashland	79.9% Hispanic	1733	David T. Peterson
Westinghouse H.S.	11	3301 W. Franklin	100% Black	1387	Stanton Payne
Williams (K-8)	6	2710 Dearborn St.	100% Black	1020	Charles Nelson
Woodson N. (5-8)	6	4414 E. Evans	100% Black	391+	William C. Taylor
* Woodson S. (K-4)	6	4511 S. Evans	100% Black	635+	Jacquelynne Parker

Phase I Schools (41) were selected at the onset of Project CANAL in 1988. Marin was added in 1989.

* Phase II Schools - New schools (23) added to Project CANAL fall 1990

--Five schools added in November 1990 include: Einstein, Hefferan, Johnson, Phillips H.S. and Wells H.S.

+ These figures also include the branch schools' enrollments.